

REMARKS

Claims 1,5,7,8,9,10, 12-22 and 32 are in the application. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejections under section 112 which are traversed in part. Specifically, the examiner's rejection of claim 9 under section 112 is in error because the claimed horizontal and vertical sections are different from the claimed cover layer and side conductive materials. See, for example, discussion in the specification beginning at page 7, line 31.

In the prior office action all of the claims were rejected based on combinations of Saito, Fujii, Czagas and Bruel. However, the claims are amended to more fully overcome possible ambiguity noted by the examiner. The claims are now fully distinguished over the art of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Ferdinand M. Romano  
Reg. No. 32752  
407-371-3250

Date: 18 December 2003